UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,038	12/13/2005	Shoou-I Wang	2443.002US2	3598
	7590 06/04/200 I, LUNDBERG & WO	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 2938		GREGORIO, GUINEVER S		
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1793		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/04/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com scape@slwip.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/518,038	WANG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
GUINEVER S. GREGORIO	1793		

	GUINEVER S. GREGORIO	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 May 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la</li> </ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(in Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date in have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the second content of the seco	f). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount o	36(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropriat	e extension fee ate extension fee
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	than three months after the mailing dat		
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the properties.</li> </ol>	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belowed)</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	**	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-28. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Melvin Curtis Mayes/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793	/GUINEVER S GREGO Examiner, Art Unit 1793	RIO/	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Allam and Horton to prevent metal dusting because Allam teaches a secondary gas heated catalytic reformer at 1305 degrees Celcius. Examiner agrees that statement is partially correct. Examiner believes applicant is refering to paragraph 78 which teaches the partial oxidation gas that enters the gas heated reformer is at 1305 degrees celcius and leaves the gas heat reformer at a temperature at about 500 degrees celcius (paragraph 79). Allam further teaches that synthesis gas is produced at temperature at 500 to 600 degrees celcius. Examiner takes the position that one of ordinary skill in the art would cool the partial oxidation stream to mitigate the metal dusting caused by the heat. Examiner takes the position that metal dusting is a well known phenomenon in the art and that multiple known methods are utilized to prevent or mitigate metal dusting. Examiner cited Prasad et al., paragraph 23 to provide evidence that metal dusting is well known. Prasad teaches various methods such as using corrosion resistant metal alloys, lowering the reaction temperature, and reducing the carbon monoxide content of the gas stream. Horton's method accomplishes both reducing the temperature and altering the carbon monoxide content of the gas stream. Examiner agrees that the reaction temperature of 500 degrees is within the temperature range known for metal dusting, but Examiner takes the position that the effects of metal dusting will be decreased because of the lower temperature and the alteration in gas content.